arXiv:1612.08234v1 [cs.DM] 25 Dec 2016

On fixed-parameter tractability of the mixed domination problem for graphs with bounded tree-width

M. Rajaati[1], *M. R. Hooshmandasl*[2], *M. J. Dinneen*[3], *A. Shakiba*[4]

[1,2]*Department of Computer Science, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran.*
[1,2,4]*The Laboratory of Quantum Information Processing, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran.*
[3]*Department of Computer Science, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.*
[4] *Department of Computer Science, Vali-e-Asr University of Rafsanjan, Rafsanjan, Iran.*
e-mail:[1]*m.rajaati@stu.yazd.ac.ir,* [2]*hooshmandasl@yazd.ac.ir,* [3]*m.dinneen@auckland.ac.nz,* [4]*ali.shakiba@vru.ac.ir.*

Abstract

A mixed dominating set for a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a set $S \subseteq V \cup E$ such that every element $x \in (V \cup E)\backslash S$ is either adjacent or incident to an element of S. The mixed domination number of a graph G, denoted by $\gamma_m(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of mixed dominating sets of G and any mixed dominating set with cardinality of $\gamma_m(G)$ is called a minimum mixed dominating set. The mixed domination problem is to find a minimum mixed dominating set for graph G and is known to be an NP-complete problem. In this paper, we present a novel approach to solve the mixed domination problem. Our new technique of assigning power to edges and vertices, and charging vertices for edges combined with with dynamic programming leads to a fixed-parameter algorithm of time $O(3^{tw^2} \times tw^2 \times |V|)$, which proves our next result, which is the mixed domination problem is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to tree-width.

Keywords: Mixed Domination; Tree decomposition; Tree-width; Fixed-parameter tractable.

1 Introduction

The mixed domination problem, traditionally called total cover problem, is first introduced in 1977 by Alavi et. al. [4]. This problem is shown to be NP-complete for general graphs in [18]. So, several approximation algorithms are proposed for solving this problem such as a 2-factor approximation algorithm by Hatami [12]. Like most interesting hard problems, mixed domination for several special classes of graphs such as split graphs remains NP-complete due to the high tree-width of their graph structure [15]. However, it is tractable for some graph classes such as cacti and trees [15]. Moreover, a parallel concept is used by Adhar et al. to solve the mixed domination problem in [1]. Their parallel NC algorithm requires $O(n)$ processors in CRCW PRAM model to solve the mixed domination problem in $O(\log n)$ time, where n is the number of graph vertices. The mixed domination problem has many practical applications such as placing phase measurement units, or PMUs, in an electric power system [18]. The mixed Roman domination problem and signed mixed Roman domination problem are generalizations of the mixed domination problem that Abdollahzadeh et al. presented bounds for the mixed Roman domination number and signed mixed Roman domination number [2, 3].

There exist different approaches to solve an NP-complete problem such as approximation, randomization, heuristics and parameterization. The parameterization method is a well known technique that

fixes certain parameters of the input to get a polynomial time algorithm with respect to the size of the input and contain exponential terms which only depend on those fixed parameters. A famous example of such parameters is the tree-width which is introduced by Robertson and Seymour in 1984 [16]. The tree-width parameter has proven to be a good measure of the intrinsic difficulty for various NP-hard problems on graphs. The tree decomposition of a graph shows the similarity of the graph to a tree and is measured by the tree-width. Most of the algorithms on the trees work efficiently, so tree decomposition of a graph can be used to speed up solving some problems on graphs with a small tree-width.

Despite the fact that some problems in graph theory cannot be solved in polynomial time even with constant tree-width, a large number of such problems are shown to be solvable in linear or polynomial time. In general, there are two methods to handle the intractability of a problem with constant tree-width. The first one uses monadic second-order logic. Since Courcelle proposed a surprising theorem which states that if a graph property can be modeled in monadic second-order logic, then there exists a finite automata or a Fly automata to check this property in linear time on graphs with a bounded tree-width [10]. The second technique is to use reductions. Bodlaender proposed interesting results which extends graph reductions to graphs with bounded tree-width [7]. Using this technique, one can study variants of many decision problems and by using a variant of these reduction algorithms, can solve optimization problems in the linear time with respect to constant tree-width [7].

Recent investigations show that algorithms which solve intractable problems act more efficiently when their input graphs are restricted to bounded tree-width ones. Much of these studies uses dynamic programming techniques to solve the problem. For example, Chimani proposed an algorithm to solve the Steiner tree problem on graphs using a well-known dynamic programming paradigm over the tree decomposition of graph and utilizes a special numbering and coloring scheme to save various states. The size of the table it computes is bounded by $O(B_{k+2} \times tw)$ where B_k is the Bell number which is the number of partitions of a k-element set [8].

In this paper, we propose a novel technique of charging power to vertices and edges, and use it in accordance with dynamic programming to compute the mixed domination number for graphs with bounded tree-width with $O(3^{tw^2} \times tw^2 \times |V|)$ time complexity which is a polynomial algorithm with respect to a fixed tree-width. The fundamental idea we use to solve the problem is to assign a power value to vertices. This way, we have shown for the first time that the mixed domination problem is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to tree-width.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give necessary notations and definitions. In Section 3, we define a concept which is a key part of our proposed algorithm. Our algorithm to solve the mixed domination problem is presented in Section 4. Also, we extend our algorithm in order to find the elements of a minimum mixed domination set in this section. In Section 5, we formally prove the correctness of the proposed algorithm. Finally, we give a conclusion and ideas for future works in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we overview the graph theory that are used through out the paper. If required, an interested reader can consult [17] and [13] for more deep introductions to graph theory.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple undirected graph. For each vertex $v \in V$, $N(v)$ denotes the open neighborhood of v defined as $N(v) = \{u \mid uv \in E\}$ and its closed neighborhood is defined as $N(v) \cup \{v\}$ which is denoted by $N[v]$. The nodes of a graph G, except for trees, are called vertices throughout this paper.

Definition 2.1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A tree decomposition of G is a pair $(\mathcal{X} = \{X_i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}, T)$,

where each X_i is a subset of V which is called a bag, T is a tree with elements of $\mathcal{I}$ as nodes and satisfies the following three properties.

1. $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X_i = V$,
2. for every edge $\{u, v\} \in E$, there is an index $i \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq X_i$,
3. for all $i, j, k \in \mathcal{I}$, if j lies on the path between i and k in T, then $X_i \cap X_k \subseteq X_j$.

The width of a tree decomposition $(\mathcal{X} = \{X_i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}, T)$ equals $\max\{|X_i| \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\} - 1$. The tree-width of a graph G, denoted by tw when G is clear from the context, is the minimum value of tw such that G has a tree decomposition of width tw.

Definition 2.2. A tree decomposition $(\mathcal{X} = \{X_i \mid i \in \mathcal{I}\}, T)$ is called a nice tree decomposition, or NT for short, if the following conditions are met:

1. Every bag of the tree has at most 2 children.
2. **(JOIN bag)** If a bag i has two children j and k, then $X_i = X_j = X_k$.
3. If a bag i has one child j, then one of the following conditions must hold:

   (INTRODUCE bag) $|X_i| = |X_j| + 1$ and $X_j \subset X_i$
   (FORGET bag) $|X_i| = |X_j| - 1$ and $X_i \subset X_j$

Lemma 2.3. *([6]) Given a tree decomposition of a graph G with width tw, and n bags, one can find a nice tree decomposition of G in linear time with width tw and $O(n)$ bags.*

Definition 2.4. A nice tree decomposition is called a very nice tree decomposition if each leaf bag contains just a single vertex.

Definition 2.5. A very nice tree decomposition is called a standard very nice tree decomposition if each bag an ordered set with $tw + 1$ elements, some of them can be null, and the position of each vertex in the bags that it appears is alike.

Next, we review a compact representation for graphs of tree-width tw which is presented by Farzan [11] and then use it to compact very nice tree decompositions. Given an unweighted, undirected, and unlabeled graph with n vertices that has a small tree-width tw, their representation provides space-efficient encodings, or oracles, to perform degree, neighborhood, and adjacency queries in constant time in the $\log n$-bit word RAM model.

Lemma 2.6. *([5]) A multiple parenthesis sequence with 2n parentheses of k types, in which the parentheses of any given type are balanced, can be represented using $(2+\epsilon)n \log k + o(n \log k)$ bits to support m-access, m-rank, m-select, m-findmatch and m-enclose in $O(1)$ time, where m-access computes access to the i^{th} label in lexicographic order, m-rank computes the number of equivalent to m, m-select computes the position of the r^{th} m and m-findmatch computes the matching closing (opening) parenthesis and m-enclose(v, i) gives the position of the tightest open parenthesis of type i which encloses v.*

For a graph G and its standard very nice tree decomposition with width tw, we modify the nice tree decomposition as follow: First, we assume that all bags contain $tw + 1$ elements where some of them might be null and assign types to all vertices in a top-down manner (e.g Figure 1b). Then, each bag is labeled by a number i ranging from 1 to $tw + 1$. This label shows the position of each element in the bag



(a) (b) (c)

Figure 1: (a) A graph, (b) one of its standard very nice tree decomposition, (c) an ordered labeled tree.

which changed, but if a bag be same as its parent, the label of this bag set similarly like as the label of its parent. In other cases, label of each bag is assigned as follow: For the vertices in the root give a vertex type i if it has index i in this ordering. For a vertex v introduced in a bag X, define $type(x) = j$, where j is the type of the vertex in the parent of X which has been replaced by v. Note that the only information associated with each bag is the type of the vertex it introduces. So we can present the tree decomposition as an ordered tree with a single label, not larger than $tw + 1$, on each bag. We assume the root introduces $tw + 1$ vertices of different types, and to make representation easier separate them in a path of bags, with labels 1 to $tw + 1$ (see Figure 1c).

To efficiently represent a very nice tree decomposition, we use Multiple Parenthesis (MP) structure constructed as follow: Assume a preorder traversal of T, denoted by τ_p. In this traversal, when we enter a bag, we add an open parenthesis followed by the label of the bag and when we leave a bag, we add a close parenthesis accompanied by the label of bag. An example of a parenthesis sequence representation for the tree of Figure 1c is shown in Figure 2.

$$(_1\ (_2\ (_2\ (_3\ (_2\ (_2\ (_1\ (_3\ )_3\ )_1\ )_2\ )_2\ )_3\ )_2\ (_2\ (_1\ (_3\ (_2\ )_2\ )_3\ )_1\ )_2\ )_2\ )_1$$

Figure 2: Balanced parenthesis as shown in tree of Figure 1c.

Lemma 2.7. *([14]) A balanced parenthesis sequence of size 2n, which is equivalent to an ordered tree of size n, can be represented in* $2n + o(n)$ *bits, and support* $access(v)$, $rank(v', ('))$, $select(v', (')$, $findmatch(v)$, *and* $child(i, v)$ *operations in constant time.*

In addition to storing the balanced parenthesis sequence, we need a table to store the edges of graph G. Edge table is a matrix of dimension $(tw+1) \times n$ which is filled by $0, 1$ and "$\star$". Each "$\star$" shows the position of a vertex in the bags and each "1" shows an edge in graph G. For example, Table 1 shows edge table of graph Figure 1a. The construction of this table with vertices sorted preorder from MP and extra data structure are presented in [11] in details. Anyway, we use the MP sequence, the big table and other data structures which are used in [11] to represent a graph with tree-width tw and to support queries in constant time.

Table 1: Edge table.

	1	4	3	2	5
1	$\star$	(4,1)	(3,1)	(2,1)	0
2	0	$\star$	(3,4)	$\star$	(5,4)
3	0	0	$\star$	(2,3)	$\star$

In a graph $G = (V, E)$, we define $N_G^e(r) = \{s \in E \mid \text{s is incident to r in graph G}\}$ and the mixed neighborhood of element $r \in V \cup E$ is denoted by $N_G^{md}(r)$ and is defined as $\{s \in V \cup E \mid \text{s is either adjacent or incident to r in G}\}$. Similarly, the closed neighborhood of v is denoted by $N_G^{md}[r]$ and equals $N_G^{md}(r) \cup \{r\}$. A subset $\mathcal{MD} \subseteq V \cup E$ is a mixed dominating set for G whenever for all $r \in V \cup E$, we have $|N_G^{md}[r] \cap \mathcal{MD}| \geq 1$. The mixed domination problem is to find a minimum sized mixed dominating set for G and $\gamma_m(G)$ denotes the minimum size among all mixed dominating sets of G.

3 Fundamental Concepts

The main idea we use to solve the mixed domination problem is to transform edge power to vertex power, i.e. we transform domination power of edges to domination power for vertices. In this section, we introduce some basic definitions which we use to solve the mixed domination problem.

Let $\mathcal{MD}$ be a mixed domination set for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $v \in X_i$. For edges and vertices in a bag, the rule of transforming domination power of edges to vertices power is as follows:

- **Power 2:** If $v \in \mathcal{MD}$, then the power of v is set equal to 2 and can dominate elements in $N_G^{md}[r]$,
- **Power 1:** If $v \notin \mathcal{MD}$ but at least one of the incident edges of vertex v is in $\mathcal{MD}$, then the power of v is set equal to 1 and the vertex can dominate all its edges,
- **Power 0:** If v and none of its incident edges is not in $\mathcal{MD}$, then the power of v is set equal to 0 and the vertex cannot dominate any edge or vertex.

A vertex $v \in X_i$ has seven possible conditions according to $v \in \mathcal{MD}$ and covered by $N_G^{md}[v]$. Table 2 illustrates. These seven states are respect to existing edges and vertices in a bag. The intuition behind these cases is as follows:

1. For the first case; v and at least one of its edges belong to $\mathcal{MD}$,
2. In the second case; v belong to $\mathcal{MD}$ however none of its edges belong to $\mathcal{MD}$,
3. In the third case; v does not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$ but at least one of its incident edges belong to $\mathcal{MD}$,
4. In the fourth case; v and all of its edges do not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$, and v and its edges are dominated,
5. In the fifth case; v and all of its edges do not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$, and v is not dominated but all its edges are dominated,
6. In the sixth case; v and all of its edges do not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$, and v is dominated but at least one of its edges is not dominated,
7. In the seventh case; v and all of its edges do not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$, and v and at least one of its edges is not dominated.

Table 2: Conditions of each vertex respect to a bag.

	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$N^e_{X_i}(v) \in \mathcal{MD}$	vertex cover	edge cover	vertex power	illustration
1	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \in \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	2	3a.
2	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	2	3b.
3	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \in \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	1	3c.
4	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	0	3d.
5	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is not covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	0	3e.
6	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is not covered	0	3f.
7	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is not covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is not covered	0	3g.

Figure 3 illustrates situations for an arbitrary vertex with respect to a bag. In these figures, each rectangle indicates a bag and vertices or edges present in $\mathcal{MD}$ are drawn bold, not covered ones are drawn by dotted lines or circles and the rest of them are covered.



(a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 3 (d) 4 (e) 5 (f) 6 (g) 7

Figure 3: Different situations for a vertex with respect to a bag.

Let T be a very nice tree decomposition for graph G, for each bag X_i in T, we define $X_i^{\triangle}$ as

$$X_i^{\triangle} = \{v \in V, \text{ such that } v \text{ is in descendant bags of } X_i, \ \forall i \in \mathcal{I}\} \tag{1}$$

and the induced subgraph af G with vertices X_i (or $X_i^{\triangle}$) as G_i (or $G_i^{\triangle}$). Let $\mathcal{MD}$ be a mixed dominating set for bag X_i and $v \in X_i$. For a vertex v, there are nine possible situations based on the intersection of $G_i^{\triangle}$ and bag X_i which are given in Table 3. By assume all element in $G_i^{\triangle}/G_i$ is dominated, seven states of Table 3 is same as Table 2, but the edges exist in $G_i^{\triangle}/G_i$ that are not dominated add two extra states to possible states of v.

8. In the eighth case; v is dominated but at least one of its edges which exist in $G_i^{\triangle}/G_i$ is not dominated,

9. In the ninth case; v and at least one of its edges which exist in $G_i^{\triangle}/G_i$ are not dominated.

In both of states v does not belong to $\mathcal{MD}$. In state 8, and In state 9, v is not dominated and at least one of its incident edges which exist in $G_i^{\triangle}/G_i$ is not dominated.

Table 3: Different cases for a vertex $v \in X_i$ with respect to appeared edges and vertices in X_i.

	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v) \in \mathcal{MD}$	vertex cover	edge is covered in this bag	edge is covered in previous bags	power	illustration
1	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \in \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	2	Figure 4a
2	$v \in \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	2	Figure 4b
3	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \in \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	1	Figure 4c
4	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	0	Figure 4d
5	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is not covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	0	Figure 4e
6	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is not covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	0	Figure 4f
7	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is not covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i}(v), uv$ is not covered	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is covered	0	Figure 4g
8	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is covered	uv is or is not covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is not covered	0	Figure 4h
9	$v \notin \mathcal{MD}$	$\forall u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv \notin \mathcal{MD}$	v is not covered	uv is or is not covered	$\exists u \in N^e_{X_i^{\triangle}}(v), uv$ is not covered	0	Figure 4i



Figure 4: Different cases for a vertex $v \in X_i$ with respect to appeared edges and vertices in X_i.

Figure 4 is like Figure 3 except that it not only shows different situations for a vertex $v \in X_i$ with respect to a bag X_i, but also it considers appeared edges and vertices in previous bags.

For each edges, there are three different states possible: (1) The edge is in the mixed dominating set, (2) it is not in the mixed dominating set, however it is covered by some element, or (3) it is not in the mixed dominating set and it is also not covered by any element. These cases are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Possible condition for an edge

1	edge belongs to the mixed dominating set.
2	edge does not belong to mixed dominating set, but it is covered
3	edge is not in mixed dominating set and also is not covered.

We have two types of tables, one is the bag table denoted by $Btable_i$ which saves all possible states for vertices and edges in the bag X_i which they can be in with respect to the elements of the bag (states of Table 2) and another one is the status table which is denoted by $Stable_i$ and saves all possible states for vertices and edges in the bag X_i which can be in with respect to not only in the bag X_i but also with vertices and edges that appeared until now in $G_i^{\triangle}$. Each table is construct as follow: in $Btable_i$ and $Stable_i$ each row represents a possible solution and each column corresponds to a vertex in X_i or existing edges between the vertices of X_i and a cost value which shows the number of mixed domination members in that row. The cells in each row of this table correspond to $v_0,\ ...,\ v_{tw},\ e_1,\ ...,\ e_{\binom{tw+1}{2}},\ cost$.

4 Proposed Algorithm

In this section, we present our algorithm to find the mixed domination number for a graph with bounded tree-width. This algorithm is consisted of three phases:

Phase 1: Finding a very nice tree decomposition of G with width at most k. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an unweighted and undirected graph with constant tree-width. We compute and then use a standard very nice tree decomposition with width tw and then extract the sequence related to this decomposition as is described in Section 2. Phase 1 can be computed in $O(n)$ using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.6.

Phase 2: Traversing on the very nice tree decomposition obtained in the previous phase in a postorder manner and denoting the traversal by τ_{du}. Traversal τ_{du} begins from the leftmost leaf and then goes up in the tree until it reaches the first join node and then goes to the leftmost leaf on the right subtree of the join node recursively. It goes up if both children of the join node are visited and visits the join node itself and continues until it reaches the root. This phase can be computed in $O(n)$ time.

Phase 3: Traversing on τ_{du} and updating corresponding tables for each bag as follow: whenever we reach a leaf bag, we create a new table which contains the possible states that a node can have. In other three cases, if a bag is an introduce or join bag, we combine the corresponding tables with each other, and if the bag is a forget bag we construct the table to obtain all of the possible states that vertices in this bag can have by considering edges and vertices which appeared heretofore.

It is clear that the time complexity of this phase relates to the time spend in processing each bag in the traversal τ_{du}.This process includes time to create a table for each leaf bag and combining two tables for introduce, forget and join bags. A new table is created with tow rows, running in constant time, therefore this operations add a constant time factor. To combine two tables we consider the worst case. A row of table for a join or an introduce bag can be created in $O(tw^2)$ and for forget bag it is $O(tw)$. The worst case for join bag happens when they have all possible cases which leads to $9^{tw+1} \times 3^{\binom{tw+1}{2}}$ rows. Therefore, the time complexity of this phase equals $O(9^{tw} \times 3^{tw^2} \times tw^2)$.

The algorithm described so far is polynomial time which respect to the size of T, $O(n)$, however it is exponential with respect to the tree-width of T, tw. The following theorem states the time complexity of our proposed algorithm.

Theorem 4.1. *The running time of the describe approach is* $O(9^{tw} \times 3^{tw^2} \times tw^2 \times n)$.

Our proposed dynamic programming algorithm works on τ_{du} which is the postorder traversal on a very nice tree decomposition of G. When the algorithm visits a bag, it describes the partial solutions to the mixed domination problem and as it continues to other bags, it extends the created partial solutions. These partial solutions need to satisfy all of the problem specific constraints in $G_i^{\triangle}$ except for the vertices in X_i and their incident edges in $G_i^{\triangle} \backslash G_i$. The status tables $Stable$ are used to store these partial solutions. In other words, an $Stable$ characterizes the partial solutions and each row in $Stable$ contains a valid assignment for vertices and edges in G_i.

To compute the $Stable$ of each bag i, our algorithm uses $Btable$ of the children of bag i. Since these tables are computed bottom-up, the final solution of the mixed domination problem appears in the root of T. So, it can be extracted by inspecting the table of the root. Algorithm 1 demonstrates how we achieve the final answer γ_{md}.

The algorithm 1 finds γ_{md} by a postorder traversal of standard very nice tree decomposition of graph and calls Algorithms 2, 3 and 4. Note that it is possible that combining two rows in different levels could have created the same rows that we store the row with minimum cost in $Stable_i$. To avoid searching and sorting to find these repeated states, we use a coding to store created rows up to now. We use a helper table in which each created row has a specific position in it. When a row is created while combining two tables, the help table is checked and if there is a row with lower cost, then the lower cost is considered and the help table is updated accordingly. Finally Algorithm 1 inspects the root table and finds γ_{md}. To illustrate the algorithm, consider the graph in Figure 5. The output of the algorithm is $\gamma_{md} = 2$. Next we describe how the tables are filled and partial solutions are computed.



Figure 5: Mixed domination

Algorithm 1 Our proposed algorithm to solve the mixed domination problem

INPUT: Preorder traversal on a standard very nice tree decomposition of graph G denoted by τ_{du}.
OUTPUT: γ_{md} for G.
for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $|\tau_{du}|$ **do**
  if X_i is a bag leaf **then**
    Create a new table with two rows each corresponding to cases 2 and 5 for the isolated vertex in X_i (see Section 4.1) .
  else if X_i is an introduce bag **then**
    for $\ell_1 \leftarrow 1$ to number of rows in $Stable_{i-1}$ **do**
      for $\ell_2 \leftarrow 1$ to number of rows in $Btable_i$ **do**
        Call Algorithm 2 with inputs $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, :)$ and $r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, :)$.
      end for
    end for
  else if X_i is a forget bag **then**
    for $\ell_1 \leftarrow 1$ to number of rows in $Stable_{i-1}$ **do**
      Call Algorithm 3 with input $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, :)$.
    end for
  else if X_i is a join bag **then**
    for $\ell_1 \leftarrow 1$ to number of rows in $Stable_{i1}$ **do**
      for $\ell_2 \leftarrow 1$ to number of rows in $Stable_{i2}$ **do**
        Call Algorithm 4 with inputs $r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, :)$ and $r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, :)$.
      end for
    end for
  end if
  Add the created rows to $Stable_i$.
end for

4.1 Table construction for leaf bags

During the traversal τ_{du}, when we observe a leaf bag, a new table is created which saves all of the possible states for the only vertex in that bag. Let X_i be a leaf bag, since we are working with a standard nice tree decomposition, every leaf bag contains exactly one vertex. For vertex $v \in X_i$, the status table i denoted as $Stable_i$ contains two rows. The first row corresponds to the situation in with vertex v belongs to an optimal mixed domination set, and the last one is for the case in which vertex v does not belong to an optimal mixed domination set. Therefore, this table has two rows where in the first row, the value of the vertex is "2" by cost "1" , and in the second row, the value of the vertex is "5" by cost "0".

4.2 Construction of the status table for an introduce bag

An introduce bag X_i has one more vertex than its child bag X_{i-1} as well as the edges that are adjacent with the new vertex and the vertices of the previous bag. Assume $Stable_{i-1}$ contains all of the possible states that can be occur up to this level for visited edges and vertices. After adding the new vertex and the corresponding edges we need to add all of the new possible states to the new $Stable_i$. To do so, we compute $Stable_i$ as $Stable_{i-1} \otimes Btable_i$. Assume that n is the size of bag X_i, e is the number of edges with both ends in X_i, $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, :)$ and $r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, :)$ are two rows of $Stable_{i-1}$ and $Btable_i$, and j references the entries of a row of a table. Then, Equation 2 describes the construction of the entries of

ℓth row of $Stable_i$.

$$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, j) = \begin{cases} r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, j) \star_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, j) & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq tw\ . \\ r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, j) *_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, j) & \text{if } tw+1 \leq j \leq tw + \binom{tw+1}{2}\ . \\ r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, j) + r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, j) - |A| - |B|, & \text{if } j = tw + \binom{tw+1}{2} + 1\ . \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where

$$A = \{\alpha \mid (r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, \alpha) \leq 2 \wedge\ r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, \alpha) \leq 2) \wedge (0 \leq \alpha \leq tw)\}. \quad (3)$$

$$B = \{\alpha \mid (r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, \alpha) = 1 \wedge\ r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, \alpha) = 1) \wedge (tw+1 \leq \alpha \leq tw + \binom{tw+1}{2})\}. \quad (4)$$

In Equation 2, two multiplication operators $\star_{Int}$ and $*_{Int}$ are used to compute the entries of $Stable_i$. The multiplication tables for those operators are given in Tables 5 and 6. Note that value " $-$ " in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 never happen. The Algorithm 2 describes aforementioned approach in constructing rows of $Stable_i$ in a formal manner.

Algorithms 2, 3 and 4 calculate the value of ℓ using Equation 5. After constructing an entire row in $Stable_i$, the value of ℓ is obtained as follow: Assume that $(r_0, r_1, ..., r_{tw}, r_{tw+1}, ..., r_{tw+\binom{tw+1}{2}}, r_{tw+\binom{tw+1}{2}+1})$ is the output of the Algorithms, then number ℓ shows the number of a row that this output is saved in it. Equation 5 shows how the value of ℓ is calculated. Array r_{HP} is used to save entries of a row until the value of ℓ is computed. If the ℓth row in $Stable_i$ is empty, the algorithm saves the output, however if the ℓth row was filled, if the new $r_{tw+\binom{tw+1}{2}+1}$ is less than the existing one, the algorithm replaces the value of $r_{tw+\binom{tw+1}{2}+1}$.

$$\ell = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{tw} r_i \times 9^i\right) + \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\binom{tw+1}{2}} r_{tw+j} \times 4^{j-1}\right) \times 9^{tw+1}\right) \quad (5)$$

Table 5: Multiplication operation for vertices in introduce bag

$\star_{Int}$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	8	8
5	4,5	1	2	3	4	5	4	5	8	9
6	4,6	1	2	3	4,6	4,6	4,6	4,6	8	8
7	4,5,6,7	1	2	3	4,6	5,7	4,6	5,7	8	9

Table 6: Multiplication operation for edges in introduce bag

$*_{Int}$	0	1	2	3
0	0	-	-	-
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	1	2	2
3	2,3	1	2	3

4.3 Construction of the status table for a forget bag

A forget bag X_i loses one vertex and its incident edges with respect to its present bag X_{i-1}. So, it is enough to omit the invalid rows from $Stable_{i-1}$ to obtain the $Stable_i$ for bag X_i. Algorithm 3 describes an approach for constructing rows of $Stable_i$. This algorithm omits rows containing vertex v with values 5, 7, 8 and 9 and for other cases, updates the corresponding values.

Algorithm 2 Status table's row construction algorithm for an introduce bag

INPUT: $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,:)$ and $r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,:)$
OUTPUT: $r_{Stable_i}(\ell,:)$
$c \leftarrow 0$
for $j \leftarrow 0$ to tw **do**
  if $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) \leq 2)$ **and** $(r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j) \leq 2)$ **then**
    $c \leftarrow c+1$
  end if
  if $|r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) \star_{int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)| = 1$ **then**
    $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) \star_{int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)$
  end if
end for
for $j \leftarrow tw+1$ to $tw + \binom{tw+1}{2}$ **do**
  if $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) = 1)$ **and** $(r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j) = 1)$ **then**
    $c \leftarrow c+1$
  end if
  if $|r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) *_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)| = 1$ **then**
    $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) *_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)$
  else
    if for $e_j = v_r v_{new}, Stable_{i-1}(\ell_1,r) \leq 3$ **then**
      $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 2$
    else
      $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 3$
    end if
  end if
end for
for $j \leftarrow 0$ to tw **do**
  if $|r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) \star_{int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)| = 2$ **then**
    if $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) = 0$ **and** $r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j) = 5$ **then**
      if $\exists_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,r) \leq 2$ **then**
        $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 4$
      else
        $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 5$
      end if
    else
      if $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s=(w_r v_j)}, r_{Stable_i}(s) \leq 2$ **then**
        $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow$ firset element of $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) *_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)$
      else
        $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow$ second element of $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1,j) *_{Int} r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2,j)$
      end if
    end if
  else
    if $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s=(w_r v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,s) \leq 2$ **and** $\exists_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,r) \leq 2$ **then**
      $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 4$
    else if $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s=(w_r v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,s) \leq 2$ **and** $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,r) \geq 3$ **then**
      $r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 5$

else if $\exists_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s=(w_r v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,s) = 3$ **and** $\exists_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,r) \leq 2$ **then**
$r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 6$
else if $\exists_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s=(w_r v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,s) = 3$ **and** $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j)}, r_{HS}(1,r) \geq 3$ **then**
$r_{HS}(1,j) \leftarrow 7$
end if
end if
end for
Calculate the value of ℓ
$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, 1 : end-1) \leftarrow r_{HS}(1, 1 : end-1)$
if $r_{Stable_i}(\ell, end) > (r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, end) + r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, end) - c)$ **then**
$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, end) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, end) + r_{Btable_i}(\ell_2, end) - c$
end if

Algorithm 3 Status table's row construction algorithm for a forget bag

INPUT: $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, :)$
OUTPUT: $r_{Stable_i}(\ell, :)$ or 0
if $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, v_{eliminated}) \geq 7)$ **or** $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, v_{eliminated}) = 5)$ **then**
Return 0
else
$r_{HS}(1, :) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, :)$
if $r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, v_{eliminated}) = 6$ **then**
if $(\forall_{v_r \in N^{md}_{X_{i-1}}(v_{eliminated}), e_s=(v_r, v_{eliminated})}, r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, r) = 6)$ **and** $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, s) = 3)$ **then**
$r_{HS}(\ell, r) \leftarrow 8$
else if $(\forall_{v_r \in N^{md}_{Bag_{i-1}}(v_{eliminated}), e_s=(v_r, v_{eliminated})}, r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, r) = 7)$ **and** $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell, s) = 3)$ **then**
$r_{HS}(\ell, r) \leftarrow 9$
end if
end if
end if
Calculate the value of ℓ
$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, :) \leftarrow r_{HS}(1, :)$
$r_{HS}(\ell, v_{eliminated}) \leftarrow 0$
$\forall_{v_r \in N^{md}_{X_{i-1}}(v_{eliminated}), e_s=(v_r, v_{eliminated})}, r_{HS}(\ell, s) \leftarrow 0$

4.4 Construction of the status table for a join bag

A join bag X_i has the same set of vertices and edges with its two children X_{i1} and X_{i2}. To construct possible states for X_i in $Stable_i$, we compute $Stable_i = Stable_{i1} \otimes Stable_{i2}$. Let $r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, :)$ and $r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, :)$ are two rows of $Stable_{i1}$ and $Stable_{i2}$, and j references the entries of a row of a table. Then Equation 2 describes how to construct the rows of $Stable_i$.

$$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, j) = \begin{cases} r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) \star_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j), & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq tw\ . \\ r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) *_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j), & \text{if } tw+1 \leq i \leq tw + \binom{tw+1}{2}\ . \\ r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) + r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j) - |A| - |B|, & \text{if } i = tw + \binom{tw+1}{2} + 1\ . \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where

$$A = \{\alpha \mid (r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, \alpha) \leq 2 \wedge\ r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, \alpha) \leq 2) \wedge (0 \leq \alpha \leq tw)\}. \quad (7)$$

$$B = \{\alpha \mid (r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, \alpha) = 1 \wedge\ r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, \alpha) = 1) \wedge (tw+1 \leq \alpha \leq tw+1+\binom{tw+1}{2})\}. \quad (8)$$

In Equation 6, two different multiplication operations $\star_{Join}$ and $*_{Join}$ are used to obtain the entries of $Stable_i$. Their multiplication tables are given in Tables 7 and 8. Algorithm 4 describes how to construct the rows of $Stable_i$ precisely.

Table 7: Multiplication operation for vertices in join bag

$\star_{Join}$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	-	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	-	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	-	1	2	3	4	4	4	4	8	8
5	-	1	2	3	4	5	4	5	8	9
6	-	1	2	3	4	4	First: 4, Second: 6	First: 4, Second: 6	8	8
7	-	1	2	3	4	5	First: 4, Second: 6	First: 5, Second: 7	8	9
8	-	1	2	3	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	-	1	2	3	8	9	8	9	8	9

Table 8: Multiplication operation for edges in Join bag

$*_{Join}$	0	1	2	3
0	0	-	-	-
1	-	1	1	1
2	-	1	2	2
3	-	1	2	3

Note that Algorithm 1 compute γ_{md} but not a minimum mixed dominating set. However, it is possible to modify the algorithm to obtain a mixed dominating set with minimum size. This modification are as follow. We first consider some fixed arbitrary one to one total numbering function ϕ used to code elements of S. Let $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$, $\phi : \{V \cup E\} \xrightarrow{1-1} \{1, 2, ..., n+m\}$ and $\psi : \phi(x) \to \{0, 1\}$.

Function ϕ determines an arbitrary order on set $\{V \cup E\}$. So, we get elements in a particular order to code partial solution. Indeed, we display a partial solution as a binary number, i.e. every element in $\{V \cup E\}$ can have two values of 0 or 1 where 0 indicates that the corresponding element is not present in the mixed domination set and 1 indicates its presence in the mixed dominating set. The function ψ is used to convert a partial solution to a binary number. So, its enough to change the algorithm and save elements of partial solution by a binary number just after constructing each state. Other changes to algorithm are straight forward. Note that the maximum number of bits that can be changed in a state is equal $k + \binom{k}{2}$.

5 Correctness

In this section we first show that finding the mixed domination number of graphs is checkable in linear-time if the graph has bounded tree-width using the Courcelle's theorem [9]. Then, we describe how to ensure that our proposed bottom-up method solves the mixed domination problem by computing partial solutions as state tables for bags. A partial solution is an object which stores all possible states for vertices and edges in a bag. Therefore, what we need to prove is showing that how a partial solution can be extended to a final solution.

To show that the mixed domination property of graphs can be checked in linear-time for graphs with bounded tree-width, we consider the following to express mixed domination in monadic second-order logic.

Algorithm 4 Status table's row construction algorithm for a join bag

INPUT: $r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, :)$ and $r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, :)$
OUTPUT: $r_{Stable_i}(\ell, :)$
for $j \leftarrow 0$ to tw **do**
  if $|r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) \star_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)| = 1$ **then**
    $r_{HS}(1, j) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) \star_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)$
  end if
  if $(r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) \leq 2)$ **and** $(r_{Stable_i}(\ell_2, j) \leq 2)$ **then**
    $c \leftarrow c + 1$
  end if
end for
for $j \leftarrow tw$ to $tw + \binom{tw+1}{2}$ **do**
  $r_{HS}(1, j) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) *_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)$
  if $(r_{Stable_{i-1}}(\ell_1, j) = 1)$ **and** $(r_{Stable_i}(\ell_2, j) = 1)$ **then**
    $c \leftarrow c + 1$
  end if
end for
for $j \leftarrow 0$ to tw **do**
  if $|r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) \star_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)| = 2$ **then**
    if $\forall_{w_r \in N^{md}_{Bag}(v_j), e_s = (w_r v_j)}, r_{HS}(1, s) \leq 2$ **then**
      $r_{HS}(\ell, j) \leftarrow$ Firset element of $r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) *_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)$
    else
      $r_{HS}(1, j) \leftarrow$ Second element of $r_{Stable_{i1}}(\ell_1, j) *_{Join} r_{Stable_{i2}}(\ell_2, j)$
    end if
  end if
end for
Calculate the value of ℓ
$r_{Stable_i}(\ell, 1 : end - 1) \leftarrow r_{HS}(1, 1 : end - 1)$
if $r_{Stable_i}(\ell, end) > (r_{Stable_{i-1}}(end) + r_{Btable_i}(end) - c)$ **then**
  $r_{Stable_i}(end) \leftarrow r_{Stable_{i-1}}(end) + r_{Btable_i}(end) - c$
end if

- vertices, edges, sets of vertices and edges of a graph G as variables of monodic second order logic.
- Relations $adj(p, q)$ and $inc(p, q)$ which are defined as follows: $adj(p, q)$ is a binary adjacency relation and it is true if and only if p and q are two adjacent vertices or are two adjacent edges of G, and $inc(p, q)$ is a binary incidence relation and it is true if and only if edge p is incident to vertex q or vertex p is incident to edge q.
- The set operations $\cup$, $\cap$, $\subseteq$ and $\in$ which denoted the union, the intersection, the subset and the membership operators.
- Unary set cardinality operator $|S|$ and the set equality operator $=$.
- The comparison operator $\leq$.
- The logical connectives AND ($\wedge$) and OR ($\vee$).

- The logical quantifiers $\forall$ and $\exists$ over vertices, edges, sets of vertices and edges of G.

By modeling the mixed domination property of graphs in the described monadic second-order logic, we can conclude that checking this property on graphs with a bounded tree-width is a linear time task. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a given simple graph. For any element $r \in V \cup E$, the mixed neighborhood of r is denoted by $N^{md}(r)$ and is defined as $N^{md}_G(r) = \{s \in V \cup E \mid adj(s, r) \vee inc(s, r)\}$ and the closed neighborhood of r is denoted by $N^{md}_G[r]$ and equals $N^{md}_G[r] = N^{md}_G(r) \cup \{r\}$. A subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq V \cup E$ is a mixed dominating set (MDS) for G, if for all $r \in V \cup E$, it is the case that $|N^{md}_G[r] \cap \mathcal{S}| \geq 1$. The mixed domination number problem asks for the size of S which is expressed as in Equation 9:

$$\exists S \subseteq (V \cup E),\ S \text{ is an MDS } \wedge\ \forall M \subseteq (V \cup E),\ M \text{ is an MDS},\ |S| \leq |M|. \tag{9}$$

To show correctness of our algorithm, it is enough to show that the extension of a partial solution satisfies the condition of the restricted form of mixed domination problem. Extending a partial solution begins by constructing a table for a leaf bag. At first, the leaf table contains two possible states (see Section 4.1). Obviously, these two states are all possible states that can occur for a vertex in a bag.

According to the definition of the tree decomposition, a bag X_i is a separator whenever it separates the vertices of $(X_i^{\triangle})\backslash X_i$ from $V\backslash(X_i^{\triangle})$, so the vertices of $(X_i^{\triangle})\backslash X_i$ do not appear in other bags except the ones descending from bag X_i. Hence, in our bottom-up approach, all of the possible states have been considered for vertices of bag X_i since they will never be considered again. using this fact, we continue the proof of correctness of our algorithm by first checking the extension of an introduce bag.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $Stable_{i-1}$ and $Btable_i$ be two tables with all possible states mentioned in Table 3 and Table 2 for X_{i-1} and X_i respectively. Combining these two tables according to Algorithm 1 produces all of the possible states for bag X_i.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. A new states state $r \in Stable_i$ is the result of multiplying two possible states $r_1 \in Stable_{i-1}$ and $r_2 \in Btable_i$. We need to show that state r cannot be produced by impossible states. Let r'_1 be a possible and r'_2 be an impossible state, hence $r'_1 \in Stable_{i-1}$ and $r'_2 \notin Btable_i$ and $r = r_1 \otimes r_2$. Since r is a possible state, then it preserve all of the restrictions of the mixed domination problem while state $r'_2 \notin Btable_i$ does not satisfy those restrictions and is impossible. So, because we cannot satisfy some restrictions in the entire problem while for a part of it, it is not satisfied. Similarly, the prof for cases $r'_1 \notin Stable_{i-1}$ and $r'_2 \in Btable_i$ or $r'_1 \notin Stable_{i-1}$ and $r'_2 \notin Btable_i$ is similar. So, combining $Stable_{i-1}$ and $Btable_i$ produces all of the possible states for bag X_i. □

In the second step we prof how extension of forget bag satisfy restriction mixed domination problem.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $Stable_{i-1}$ be a table with all possible states for bag X_{i-1}. Deleting invalid rows from this table produces all of the possible states for bag X_i.*

Proof. Suppose that the vertex v is the forget vertex, thus it does not appear in later steps, all of its edges have appeared up to now and all the its possible states are checked before constructing $Stable_{i-1}$. For vertex v and its edges, there are four cases to consider:

1. **vertex v and its edges are dominated:** In these cases, the value of vertex v is either 1, 2, 3 or 4. So, they are valid cases and remain in $Stable_i$

2. **vertex v is not dominated:** For these cases, the value of v is either 5, 7 or 9. So, they are invalid cases and are not allocated to appear in $Stable_i$ since no neighbor of vertex v appeared till now.

3. **vertex v is dominated but at least one of its edges in $G^{\triangle}_{i-1} \backslash G_{i-1}$ is not dominated:** Let e be an edge in $G^{\triangle}_{i-1} \backslash G_{i-1}$ which is not dominated. Edge e causes the value of vertex v to be 8 and makes invalid cases. So, these cases must be omitted from $Stable_i$ since edge e has not any neighbor which appeared till now.

4. **vertex v and its edges in $G^{\triangle}_{i-1} \backslash G_{i-1}$ are dominated but at least one of its edges in G_{i-1} is not dominated:** Let $e = (v, v')$ be an edge in G_{i-1} that is not dominated. So, edge e causes that the value of v to be 6. By deleting vertex v, edge e is converted to an external edge for bag i and does not appear in G_i. However it is possible that an edge appears in later steps and dominated e, so this states can be extended to a solution and we need to save it. So, we consider the effect of edge e on vertex v' and change the value of vertex v'.

□

In the third step, we are going to check the correctness of our algorithm in the extension of a join bag.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $Stable_{i1}$ and $Stable_{i2}$ be tables with all possible states mentioned in Table 3 and Table 2 for children of bag X_i. Combining these two tables produces all of the possible states for bag X_i.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. The proof of correctness is similar to Lemma 5.1. With this difference that $r'_1 \in Stable_{i1}$ and $r'_2 \notin Stable_{i2}$ and for other cases similarly $r'_1 \notin Stable_{i1}$ and $r'_2 \in Stable_{i2}$ and $r'_1 \notin Stable_{i1}$ and $r'_2 \notin Stable_{i2}$. □

Theorem 5.4. *Our proposed mixed domination algorithm produces all possible states satisfying the mixed domination problem.*

Proof. A partial solution starts by considering a leaf bag and initializing the leaf table to contain all two possible states. By Lemmas 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, we proved that every extension of partial solutions contain all of the possible states that satisfy the conditions of mixed domination problem, so, our algorithm produces all possible states that satisfy mixed domination. □

Lemma 5.5. *Every extension of a partial solution preserves possible states with minimum cost.*

Proof. The Algorithm 1 stores rows of $Stable_i$ using a coding scheme and updates the state with minimum cost. So, every extension of a partial solution preserves possible states with minimum cost. □

Theorem 5.6. *Our proposed dynamic algorithm computes γ_{md} of graphs with constant tree-width in the status table of root bag, e.g. $Stable_{root}$ in $O(9^{tw} \times 3^{tw^2} \times tw^2 \times n)$ time.*

Proof. According to the Theorem 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, our algorithm preserves possible states with minimum cost in every bag, so $Stable_{root}$ contains all of the possible states with minimum cost. To find γ_{md}, it is enough for the algorithm to find the smallest cost among all of the possible states in the root bag. Also Theorem 4.1 expresses the time complexity of this algorithm. So, the desired result is obtained. □

6 Conclusion

Mixed domination problem has many applications in electric power systems. In this paper, we proposed a novel algorithm to find the mixed dominating number of graphs with bounded tree-width. Our algorithm used a novel technique of imputing edge domination power to vertices of graph. Using this technique and by analyzing our algorithm, we have shown for the first time that the mixed domination problem is

fixed-parameter tractable. As a future work, we suggest to enhance the running time of our algorithm for special classes of graphs. Studying other parameters for the mixed domination problem such as path-width seems a fruitful topic, too. More importantly, exploiting our technique of imputing power to vertices from edges to solve other graph problems is another research direction.

Acknowledgement

This article has been written while the second author was in a sabbatical visit to the University of Auckland. He would like to express his gratitude to Prof. Cristian S. Calude and his research group for the nice and friendly hospitality.

References

[1] ADHAR, G. S., AND PENG, S. Mixed domination in trees: a parallel algorithm. *Congr. Numer 100* (1994), 73–80.

[2] AHANGAR, H. A., ASGHARSHARGHI, L., SHEIKHOLESLAMI, S., AND VOLKMANN, L. Signed mixed roman domination numbers in graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* (2015), 1–19.

[3] AHANGAR, H. A., HAYNES, T. W., AND VALENZUELA-TRIPODORO, J. Mixed roman domination in graphs. *Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society* (2015), 1–12.

[4] ALAVI, Y., BEHZAD, M., LESNIAK-FOSTER, L. M., AND NORDHAUS, E. Total matchings and total coverings of graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory 1*, 2 (1977), 135–140.

[5] BARBAY, J., ALEARDI, L. C., HE, M., AND MUNRO, J. I. Succinct representation of labeled graphs. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation* (2007), Springer, pp. 316–328.

[6] BODLAENDER, H. L. A linear-time algorithm for finding tree-decompositions of small treewidth. *SIAM Journal on computing 25*, 6 (1996), 1305–1317.

[7] BODLAENDER, H. L., AND VAN ANTWERPEN-DE FLUITER, B. Reduction algorithms for graphs of small treewidth. *Information and Computation 167*, 2 (2001), 86–119.

[8] CHIMANI, M., MUTZEL, P., AND ZEY, B. Improved steiner tree algorithms for bounded treewidth. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms 16* (2012), 67–78.

[9] COURCELLE, B. The monadic second-order logic of graphs. I. recognizable sets of finite graphs. *Information and computation 85*, 1 (1990), 12–75.

[10] COURCELLE, B. Fly-automata for checking monadic second-order properties of graphs of bounded tree-width. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics 50* (2015), 3–8.

[11] FARZAN, A., AND KAMALI, S. Compact navigation and distance oracles for graphs with small treewidth. *Algorithmica 69*, 1 (2014), 92–116.

[12] HATAMI, P. An approximation algorithm for the total covering problem. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory 27*, 3 (2007), 553–558.

[13] HAYNES, T. W., HEDETNIEMI, S., AND SLATER, P. *Fundamentals of domination in graphs*. CRC Press, 1998.

[14] HE, M., MUNRO, J. I., AND RAO, S. S. Succinct ordinal trees based on tree covering. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming* (2007), Springer, pp. 509–520.

[15] LAN, J. K., AND CHANG, G. J. On the mixed domination problem in graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science 476* (2013), 84–93.

[16] ROBERTSON, N., AND SEYMOUR, P. D. Graph minors. III. planar tree-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 36*, 1 (1984), 49–64.

[17] WEST, D. B., ET AL. *Introduction to graph theory*, vol. 2. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.

[18] ZHAO, Y., KANG, L., AND SOHN, M. Y. The algorithmic complexity of mixed domination in graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science 412*, 22 (2011), 2387–2392.